

Application No.: 10/354,207

2003P02028WOUS  
Axel HUEGLE *et al.*

## REMARKS

### *Claim Status*

After entry of this Amendment, Claims 14 – 21 are pending. By this Amendment, the claims are not amended. No new matter has been added.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102*

The Examiner rejects Claims 14 – 17, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huegle (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0021763). Hence, the Examiner asserts that Huegle discloses each and every limitation, for example, of independent Claim 14. Applicants traverse for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

For example, the Examiner asserts with reference to Huegle's support bridge 41 that Huegle discloses a support arranged to be moved at least partially out of the housing. Huegle's support bridge 41 is screwed to the retainer 26 via threaded holes 28 – 31 and through holes 47 – 49. ([0027]) The retainer 26 itself is connected to the top panel 9 via elevations 38, 39, 40, as shown in Figs. 5 and 6. ([0026]) Therefore, the support bridge 41 is not arranged to be moved at least partly out of the housing, as required by Claim 14.

Further, the Examiner asserts with reference to Fig. 3 and [0027] that Huegle discloses at least two first guide elements arranged on and fastened to the support on two opposite sides. The Examiner does not identify these guide elements via any reference numeral. As Fig. 3 shows the retainer 26, but not the support bridge 41, Applicant is not sure what elements the Examiner views as the first guide elements. Applicant respectfully requests clarification.

In this regard, Applicant notes that Huegle's support bridge 41 has legs 50, 51 on opposite sides, and guide rails 64, 65 shaped by means of cutouts 62, 63 provided in the legs 50, 51. (Fig. 4, [0028]) Assuming the Examiner refers to these guide rails 64, 65, Applicant is not sure what elements the Examiner then views as the second guide rails specified in Claim 14, when referring to [0027 – 0030]. Applicant respectfully requests clarification.

Huegle discloses further that the support 10 is assigned running rails 67, 68 in the top part 5 of the housing 2, wherein the running rail 67 is fixed directly to the side wall 6 of the top part 5, and the running rail 68 is integrally molded on structural part 69. ([0029]) However, these rails 67, 68 do not correspond to the support bridge 41.

Application No.: 10/554,207

JUL 12 2007

2003P02028WOUS  
Axel HUEGLE et al.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that Huegle fails to disclose first and second guide elements, wherein the second guide elements correspond to the first guide elements on the support and are arranged on both sides of the support such that the support is guided by means of the guide during a movement in or against an insertion direction, and wherein the second guide elements are fastened to a central base support which substantially overlaps the support, at least periodically, in that the first guide elements and the central base support are fastened and braced against one another to the basic housing body by means of fastening elements. Therefore, Huegle does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in Claim 14, and, consequently, does not anticipate or suggest the subject matter of Claim 14. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and to pass Claim 14 to allowance.

Claims 15 - 21 depend from Claim 14. These dependent claims recite additional inventive features that are in combination with the features of Claim 14 not disclosed or suggested by Huegle. The above arguments regarding amended Claim 1 are repeated herewith. Each dependent claim is, therefore, on its own patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and to withdraw the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and to pass Claims 15 - 21 to allowance.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicant notes the indicated allowability of Claims 18 and 19. In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that Claims 18 and 19 are allowable as depending from Claim 14, which is believed to be allowable, as discussed above.

#### CONCLUSION

The present response is intended to correspond with the Revised Amendment Format. Should any part of the present response not be in full compliance with the requirements of the Revised Amendment Format, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned for immediate correction.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is herewith respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/554,207


2003P02028WOUS  
Axel HUEGLE *et al.*

Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issues promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502464 referencing attorney docket number 2003P02028WOUS. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/12/07

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Musone  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,961  
Tel: (407) 736 6449  
Customer No.: 28204